



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,863	11/21/2003	Kevin M. Pinter	149-0170US	1363
29855	7590	11/21/2007		
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070			EXAMINER PHAM, KHANH B	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

10/718,863

11/21/03

PINTAR

EXAMINER

K. PHAM

ART UNIT

PAPER

2166

20071119

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

In section (9) of the Examiner Answer mailed 11/01/2007, The 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection was inadvertently omitted. Please insert the following rejection at the end of page 8 of the Examiner Answer:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought, to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-13 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Patent No: 6,366,917 to St John Herbert, III (hereinafter Herbert).

Claim 12.

Hayashi discloses the elements of claim 8 as above but it does not explicitly indicate the elements of claim 12. Herbert discloses the claimed elements, wherein the act of extracting data comprises [extract information, table, See Herbert Col 5 lines 20- 22]: identifying a row in the database table [identifier, row, database, table, Col 9 lines 44-50]; determining a version associated with the identified row [identifier, table version, row, database, table, Col 9 lines 44-50]; and extracting data from the identified row in accordance with the determined version [extract information, table, version, See Herbert Col 5 lines 20-22, Col 9 lines 44-50].

Claim 13.

The combination of Hayashi and Herbert discloses the elements of claim 12, and furthermore it discloses wherein the acts of identifying, determining and extracting are repeated for each row in the database table [See Herbert Col 11 lines 3-6].

Subject matter of claims 25 - 26 are rejected in the analysis above in claims 12 - 13 and these claims are rejected on that basis.

K. Pham

KHANH B. PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER